

## LEE CENTRAL HIGH

1800 Wisacky Highway  
Bishopville, South,

<b>Grades</b>	9-12 High School	
<b>Enrollment</b>	685 Students	
<b>Principal</b>	Nathaniel Nelson	803-428-4020
<b>Superintendent</b>	Dr. Cleo Richardson	803-484-5327
<b>Board Chair</b>	Sanya Moses	803-428-5603

# THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA 2010 ANNUAL SCHOOL REPORT CARD

## RATINGS OVER 5-YEAR PERIOD

YEAR	ABSOLUTE RATING	GROWTH RATING
<b>2010</b>	<b>Below Average</b>	<b>Excellent*</b>
2009	Below Average	At-Risk
2008	Below Average	Good
2007	Below Average	Average
2006	At-Risk	Below Average

\* The School's 2010 Growth Rating was raised one level because of substantial improvement in the achievement of students belonging to historically underachieving groups of students. The Growth Rating may or may not have been affected by the performance of these groups in prior years.

## DEFINITIONS OF SCHOOL RATING TERMS

- Excellent – School performance substantially exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision
- Good – School performance exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision
- Average – School performance meets the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision
- Below Average – School is in jeopardy of not meeting the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision
- At-Risk – School performance fails to meet the standards for progress toward the 2020 SC Performance Vision

## SOUTH CAROLINA PERFORMANCE GOAL

By 2010, SC's student achievement will be ranked in the top half of the states nationally. To achieve this goal, we must become one of the fastest improving systems in the country.

## SOUTH CAROLINA PERFORMANCE VISION

By 2020 all students will graduate with the knowledge and skills necessary to compete successfully in the global economy, participate in a democratic society and contribute positively as members of families and communities.

ABSOLUTE RATINGS OF HIGH SCHOOLS WITH STUDENTS LIKE OURS\*

Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	At-Risk
0	2	12	5	15

\* Ratings are calculated with data available by 03/24/2011.

High School Assessment Program (HSAP) Exam Passage Rate: Second Year Students

	Our High School			High Schools with Students Like Ours		
Percent	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010
Passed 2 subtests (%)	68.0%	57.1%	59.1%	64.8%	58.5%	59.7%
Passed 1 subtest (%)	13.8%	20.2%	20.7%	15.9%	20.6%	19.5%
Passed no subtests (%)	18.2%	22.7%	20.1%	19.8%	23.7%	23.1%

HSAP Passage Rate by Spring 2010

	Our High School	High Schools with Students Like Ours
Percent	88.6%	81.7%

Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rate

	Our High School		High Schools with Students Like Ours	
	2009*	2010	2009*	2010
Number of Students in Four-Year Cohort	157	174	103	131
Number of Graduates in Cohort	125	146	65	83
Rate	79.6%	83.9%	57.7%	61.0%

\*Used to calculate current AYP.

End of Course Tests

Percent of tests with scores of 70 or above on:	Our High School	High Schools with Students Like Ours*
Algebra 1/Math for the Technologies 2	36.7%	56.3%
English 1	44.9%	49.2%
Physical Science	39.6%	33.8%
US History and the Constitution	24.1%	23.8%
All Tests	35.9%	40.1%

\* High Schools with Poverty Indices of no more than 5% above or below the index for this school.

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable    N/AV–Not Available    N/C–Not Collected    N/R–Not Reported    I/S–Insufficient Sample

School Profile

	Our School	Change from Last Year	High Schools with Students Like Ours	Median High School
Students (n=685)				
Retention rate	6.6%	Down from 10.5%	5.3%	3.7%
Attendance rate	91.6%	Down from 94.3%	94.7%	95.4%
Eligible for gifted and talented	1.4%	Up from 0.9%	2.9%	12.4%
With disabilities other than speech	12.8%	Down from 13.5%	14.8%	12.8%
Older than usual for grade	18.7%	Up from 16.2%	14.7%	9.1%
Out-of-school suspensions or expulsions for violent and/or criminal offenses	0.7%	Down from 1.3%	1.9%	1.1%
Enrolled in AP/IB programs	36.4%	Up from 18.9%	4.1%	13.1%
Successful on AP/IB exams	N/A	N/A	40.0%	50.4%
Eligible for LIFE Scholarship	37.0%	Up from 35.1%	26.4%	30.4%
Annual dropout rate	0.9%	Down from 4.0%	2.4%	3.1%
Career/technology students in co-curricular organizations	9.2%	Up from 0.0%	3.4%	2.2%
Enrollment in career/technology courses	6	Down from 440	232	424
Students participating in work-based experiences	58.0%	Up from 15.1%	8.3%	11.7%
Career/technology students attaining technical skills	97.8%	Up from 79.6%	74.2%	78.7%
Career/technology completers placed	N/A	N/A	97.1%	98.5%
Teachers (n=37)				
Teachers with advanced degrees	54.1%	Down from 63.4%	54.3%	60.4%
Continuing contract teachers	51.4%	Up from 41.5%	58.7%	76.6%
Teachers with emergency or provisional certificates	29.0%	Down from 32.4%	19.4%	6.5%
Teachers returning from previous year	71.4%	Up from 70.0%	78.3%	86.8%
Teacher attendance rate	95.6%	Down from 96.0%	96.2%	95.8%
Average teacher salary*	\$42,056	Down 6.8%	\$44,706	\$47,390
Professional development days/teacher	6.4 days	Up from 5.3 days	10.3 days	10.0 days
School				
Principal's years at school	2.0	Up from 1.0	3.0	4.0
Student-teacher ratio in core subjects	24.3 to 1	Down from 25.2 to 1	21.3 to 1	25.8 to 1
Prime instructional time	85.8%	Down from 89.0%	89.4%	90.1%
Dollars spent per pupil**	\$7,151	Down 21.0%	\$10,539	\$7,974
Percent of expenditures for teacher salaries**	52.1%	Down from 57.6%	52.3%	55.4%
Percent of expenditures for instruction**	56.3%	Down from 65.3%	59.0%	60.4%
Opportunities in the arts	Excellent	Up from Good	Good	Excellent
SACS accreditation	Yes	No Change	Yes	Yes
Parents attending conferences	99.9%	No Change	97.4%	96.0%
Character development program	Excellent	No Change	Good	Good
Modern language program assessment	N/A	N/A	Average	Average
Classical language program assessment	N/A	N/A	N/A	Average

\* Includes current year teachers contracted for 185 or more days.

\*\* Prior year audited financial data are reported.

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A--Not Applicable    N/AV--Not Available    N/C--Not Collected    N/R--Not Reported    I/S--Insufficient Sample

Performance By Student Groups

	HSAP Passage Rate by Spring 2010		End of Course Tests Passage Rate		On-time Graduation Rate, 2010		
	n	%	t	%	n	%	Met AYP Objective
All Students	149	88.6%	582	35.9%	174	83.9%	No
Gender							
Male	70	82.9%	285	34.0%	82	78.0%	N/A
Female	79	93.7%	297	37.7%	92	89.1%	N/A
Racial/Ethnic Group							
White	N/A	N/A	12	66.7%	N/A	N/A	N/A
African American	145	89.0%	560	35.2%	169	84.6%	N/A
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian/Alaskan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Disability Status							
Disabled	N/A	N/A	56	17.9%	12	33.3%	N/A
Migrant Status							
Migrant	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
English Proficiency							
Limited English Proficient	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Socio-Economic Status							
Subsidized meals	110	89.1%	478	35.1%	130	83.1%	N/A

NOTE: n=number of students on which percentage is calculated; t=number of tests taken.

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable    N/AV–Not Available    N/C–Not Collected    N/R–Not Reported    I/S–Insufficient Sample

Report of Principal and School Improvement Council

Lee Central High School is striving to excel in all aspects of the school program. Our motto is “Academic excellence is our ultimate goal—Failure is not an option.” Lee Central is proud of its accomplishments and acknowledgements. The graduating class received over 4.4 million dollars in scholarship offers with 50 seniors receiving LIFE Scholarships. Twelve students earned a combined verbal and mathematics score of 1000 or above on the SAT or an ACT score of 21 or above, we had ten Newberry College Scholars, five students received academic achievement awards from Coker College and five from Furman University. One student named the “Best of the Class 2010” - WLTX , four students were winners of the Care South Carolina Art contest. The 2009-2010 Teen Lead Regional meeting was hosted at Lee Central High School. Physics Honors students participated in the Popsicle Bridge Building Contest sponsored by Central Carolina College and won 1st place for the best Presentation. Three hundred and thirty-four students received awards at our Annual Academic Awards Banquet. Twenty students received awards from the Columbia Urban League. Four students participated (and were the winning team out of forty presentations) in a summer training program using their skills in technology sponsored by the MicroBurst Learning Program in cooperation with the South Carolina Department of Education and the South Carolina Commerce. Their project will be used by Career Development Specialist for Pathways Across South Carolina via The Kuder Connect 2 Business System. As part of the High Schools That Work initiative, Lee Central High School implemented a comprehensive system of extra help for students. All teachers provided tutorials. Students also utilized Nova Net for course mastery as well as credit recovery for attendance.

Lee Central High School continues to enjoy outstanding success in extra-curricular activities. One student was selected to the South Carolina Region V Honor Band member. Two Chorus students were selected to participate on the All-State Choir. JROTC participated in the Adopt-A-Highway Program and have won numerous awards at Drill and Rifle Competitions. Girls' and Boys' track teams qualified to participate in the Upper State Track Meet, the golf team qualified to participate in the Golf Tournament for the second year in the school's history. Three athletes were selected as Region 4 Class AA - All Conference Players (two varsity basketball girls and one varsity basketball boy). Two students participated in the Special Olympics and received Bronze medals. One student won the State 2A Long Jump Title, to capture a gold medal.

We recognize that all of our stakeholders are a key component to the success of Lee Central High School. Parents, community members, ministerial, and business partners participated in the PTO, School Improvement Council, and various booster clubs. The Guidance Department, Curriculum Leadership Team, and administrators coordinated several programs including, but not limited to parent coffees, open house, and financial aid workshops, which increased parental involvement.

Dr. Nathaniel Nelson, Principal  
Rodney James, School Improvement Council Chairperson

Evaluations by Teachers, Students and Parents

	Teachers	Students*	Parents*
Number of surveys returned	21	144	98
Percent satisfied with learning environment	81.0%	56.9%	69.5%
Percent satisfied with social and physical environment	95.2%	62.9%	60.0%
Percent satisfied with school-home relations	57.1%	74.8%	76.6%

\* Only eleventh grade students and their parents were included. For schools without grade eleven, only the highest grade was included.

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable    N/AV–Not Available    N/C–Not Collected    N/R–Not Reported    I/S–Insufficient Sample

School Adequate Yearly Progress

NO

This school met 7 out of 13 objectives. The objectives included student performance, graduation rate or student attendance, and participation in the state testing program.

Definition: As required by the United States Department of Education, Adequate Yearly Progress specifies that the statewide target is met for "All Students" and for the following subgroups: Racial/Ethnic, Subsidized Meals, Disability, and Limited English Proficiency in the areas of English/Language Arts and Mathematics, as well as meeting the statewide target for "All Students" for attendance or graduation rate.

School Improvement Status

NI

School Improvement Key

NI	Newly Identified-The school missed adequate yearly progress (AYP) for two years. Sanction: Offer school choice.
CSI	Continuing School Improvement-The school missed AYP for three years. Sanctions: Continue school choice and implement supplemental services.
CA	Corrective Action-The school missed AYP for four years. Sanction: Continue school choice and supplemental services. The school district takes a corrective action.
RP	Plan to Restructure-Sanctions: Continue school choice and supplemental services. Develop a plan to restructure. If the school misses AYP the next year, the school implements the restructuring plan.
R	Restructure-The school missed AYP after two years of corrective action. Sanctions: Implement the restructuring plan. Continue school choice and supplemental services.
DELAY	The school met AYP in all subgroups and the indicator for one year, thus the delay provision applies. The school remains in the same status as last year and is referred to as in "Delay."
HOLD	The school made progress for one year in the subject area that identified the school for school improvement. The school remains in the same status as last year and is referred to as in "Hold."

Teacher Quality Data

	Our District	State
Classes in low poverty schools not taught by highly qualified teachers	N/A	1.9%
Classes in high poverty schools not taught by highly qualified teachers	11.7%	5.6%

	Our School	State Objective	Met State Objective
Classes not taught by highly qualified teachers	12.4%	0.0%	No

Abbreviations for Missing Data

HSAP Performance By Group

	Enrollment 1st Day of Testing	% Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	School % Proficient or Advanced*	District % Proficient or Advanced*	State % Proficient or Advanced*	Performance Objective Met	Participation Objective Met
English/Language Arts - State Performance Objective = 71.3% (Proficient or Advanced)											
All Students	164	100	26.3	44.2	25.6	3.8	44.9	43.4	65.9	No	Yes
Male	87	100	31.3	41	22.9	4.8	38.6	37.1	60.8	N/A	N/A
Female	77	100	20.5	47.9	28.8	2.7	52.1	50.6	71	N/A	N/A
White	2	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	77.5	I/S	I/S
African American	160	100	26.1	44.4	25.5	3.9	45.1	43.5	49.7	No	Yes
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	80.2	I/S	I/S
Hispanic	2	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	56.8	I/S	I/S
American Indian/Alaskan	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	65.9	I/S	I/S
Disabled	18	100	70.6	23.5	0	5.9	5.9	10	21.3	I/S	I/S
Migrant	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	I/S	N/A	N/A
Limited English Proficient	2	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	47.3	I/S	I/S
Subsidized meals	136	100	27.1	46.5	22.5	3.9	43.4	42.6	51.5	No	Yes

Mathematics - State Performance Objective = 70.0% (Proficient or Advanced)											
All Students	164	100	35.3	37.8	23.1	3.8	37.8	37.3	62.3	No	Yes
Male	87	100	38.6	36.1	22.9	2.4	36.1	36	61.7	N/A	N/A
Female	77	100	31.5	39.7	23.3	5.5	39.7	39	63	N/A	N/A
White	2	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	75	I/S	I/S
African American	160	100	35.9	37.9	22.2	3.9	36.6	36	44	No	Yes
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	85.5	I/S	I/S
Hispanic	2	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	56.7	I/S	I/S
American Indian/Alaskan	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	62.5	I/S	I/S
Disabled	18	100	76.5	23.5	0	0	0	5	22.1	I/S	I/S
Migrant	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	I/S	N/A	N/A
Limited English Proficient	2	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	52.6	I/S	I/S
Subsidized meals	136	100	36.4	38.8	22.5	2.3	35.7	35.3	48.1	No	Yes

Physical Science (End-of-Course Test performance by Group)											
All Students	164	89.6	84.4	8.8	4.8	2.0	6.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Male	86	90.7	89.7	6.4	2.6	1.3	3.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Female	78	88.5	78.3	11.6	7.2	2.9	10.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White	2	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
African American	160	89.4	84.6	8.4	4.9	2.1	7.0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian/Pacific Islander	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hispanic	2	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
American Indian/Alaskan	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Disabled	16	56.3	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV	N/AV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Migrant	N/A	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Limited English Proficient	2	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Subsidized meals	136	89.7	85.2	10.7	4.1	0.0	4.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

\* Adjusted to account for natural variation in performance.

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A–Not Applicable    N/AV–Not Available    N/C–Not Collected    N/R–Not Reported    I/S–Insufficient Sample

Two-Year HSAP Trend Data

	School Year	Enrollment 1st Day of Testing	% Tested	% Below Basic	% Basic	% Proficient	% Advanced	School % Proficient or Advanced*	District % Proficient or Advanced*	State % Proficient or Advanced*
--	-------------	-------------------------------	----------	---------------	---------	--------------	------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------

English/Language Arts - State Performance Objective = 71.3% (Proficient or Advanced)

All Students	2009	166	98.8	26.1	42.7	27.4	3.8	40.1	40.7	61.8
	2010	164	100	26.3	44.2	25.6	3.8	44.9	43.4	65.9

Mathematics - State Performance Objective = 70.0% (Proficient or Advanced)

All Students	2009	166	98.8	37.3	38	19.6	5.1	42.4	41.7	62.7
	2010	164	100	35.3	37.8	23.1	3.8	37.8	37.3	62.3

\* Adjusted to account for natural variation in performance.